

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 remain pending in the application and stand rejected. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for the reasons set forth below, and respectfully request reconsideration.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, 10-13, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,840,561 to Mills et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0184064 to Hier et al. Claims 1, 10, and 16 are the only independent claims of this rejected group. Claim 1 is directed to an automotive visor comprising "a polymeric cover layer integrally formed in place onto said outer surface of said core member." Claims 10 and 16 are directed to methods of forming an automotive visor, comprising "integrally forming a cover layer in place on an outer surface of the visor core." Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 1, 10, and 16 because Mills '561 does not disclose each and every element recited in these claims, and because persons skilled in the art would not have found it obvious to modify Mills '561 in view of Hier '064, as alleged by the Examiner.

Mills '561 is directed to an automotive visor comprising a core 12 and a separate cover material 14 made of fabric. The core has a clamshell configuration with first and second core halves 20, 22 that are folded about a living hinge 24 (Mills '561 at col. 3, lines 43-46). The cover material 14 is secured to the core 12 by wrapping the cover 14 around the peripheral lips 60, 62 of each core half 20, 22 and folding the core halves

about the living hinge 24 to capture the edges 58 of the cover 14 between the core halves. (Mills '561 at col. 4, lines 1-29.) Hier '064 is directed to a vehicle instrument panel comprising a retainer portion 12 having an opening 20 defining a void over an airbag 16, and a door 14 formed over the opening 20 through which the airbag 16 may be deployed. The Examiner admits that Mills '561 fails to disclose a polymeric cover layer integrally formed in place on an outer surface of a core member. Rather, Mills '561 utilizes foldable core halves to secure fabric cover material to a visor. To cure this deficiency, the Examiner alleges that it would have been obvious to "cover the core member of Mills '561 with a formed in place polymeric cover layer, as taught by Hier '064, in place of the cover layer of Mills '561 to provide a seamless cover that requires less steps to manufacture." (Office Action dated April 13, 2007 at page 3.) Hier '064 is concerned with hiding seams in a molded instrument panel where an airbag will be deployed. Neither Hier '064 nor any other reference of record discloses replacing a fabric cover layer with a polymeric cover layer that is molded in place.

The Office Action fails to provide an apparent reason to modify Mills '561 in view of Hier '064. The motivation alleged by the Examiner fails because, even if a polymeric cover layer were applied to the core 12 of Mills '561, the clamshell configuration of Mills '561 still requires that the core halves 20, 22 be folded about the living hinge 24 to form the visor. Accordingly, the combination asserted by the Examiner would not provide a seamless cover as alleged to be motivation for the combination. For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1, 10, and 16 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-6 depend from independent claim 1, and claims 11-13 each depend from independent claim 10. Accordingly, claims 2-6 and 11-13 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons discussed above for independent claims 1 and 10 and Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of these claims over Mills '561 in view of Hier '064 be withdrawn.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Mills '561 and Hier '064, in further view of British Patent Application No. GB 2 336 577 to Fischer et al. Claim 7 depends from independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 7 because the combination of Mills' 561 and Hier '064 fails to teach or suggest all the elements of claim 7, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, and because the further combination of Mills '561 and Hier '064 with Fischer '577 fails to cure these deficiencies.

Specifically, Fischer '577 fails to disclose replacing a fabric cover material with a cover layer that is integrally formed in place on the outer surface of a core member of a visor. Moreover, Fisher '577 fails to disclose a polymeric cover layer that is textured to simulate fabric material, as set forth in claim 7. In this regard, Applicants note that the Office Action fails to indicate the relevant column or page number, and the line numbers of Fischer '577 relied upon as the basis for rejecting claim 7. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 9, 14, 15, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Mills '561 and Hier '064 in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,720,509 to Binnish. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections

because the combination of Mills '561 and Hier '064 fails to teach or suggest all elements recited in these claims, as discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 10, and 16, and the further combination with Binnish '509 does not cure these deficiencies. Moreover, Binnish '509 is directed to an automotive visor wherein a foam material is injected into a fabric over that is placed into a mold so that the foam expands to form lips 27, 47 over a mirror or door opener. Binnish '509, therefore, does not disclose an integrally molded cover that affixes accessories such as a mirror or a door opener to a core member of a visor, as recited in claims 8, 9, 14, 15, 17, and 18. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 8, 9, 14, 15, 17, and 18 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks set forth herein, Applicants believe this case is in condition for allowance and respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes any issue requires further discussion, the Examiner is respectfully asked to telephone the undersigned attorney so that the matter may be promptly resolved. The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is appreciated.

Applicants are of the opinion that no fees are due as a result of this communication. However, if any fees are necessary to complete this communication, the Commissioner may consider this to be a request for such and charge any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 23-3000.

Application No. 10/711,457
Reply to Office Action of April 13, 2007
Response dated July 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

By: /David W. Dorton/
David W. Dorton, Reg. No. 51,625

2700 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 241-2324 (voice)
(513) 241-6234 (facsimile)